

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

---

ARISE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE;  
 OISTE?; NEW ENGLAND STATE-AREA  
 CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP;  
 REV. TALBERT W. SWAN, II;  
 NORMAN W. OLIVER; DARLENE  
 ANDERSON; GUMERSINDO GOMEZ;  
 FRANK BUNTIN; RAFAEL  
 RODRIGUEZ; and DIANA NURSE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF SPRINGFIELD and  
 SPRINGFIELD ELECTION COMMISSION,

Defendants.

---

Civil Action No. 05-30080 MAP

**OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO MODIFY TRIAL PROCEDURES**

Plaintiffs strenuously object to defendants' motion to modify trial procedures, which has been filed literally on the eve of trial. Defendants have had plaintiffs' affidavits since February 2, 2007.<sup>1</sup> Defendants' request to change procedures that the Court put in place long ago comes too late.

Furthermore, contrary to defendants' Certificate of Consultation, defendants raised the issue of supplementation on February 26, 2007, and plaintiffs responded the next day with a letter, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit A. The letter stated opposition to wholesale supplementation, and noted that "Both sides had to submit their affidavits simultaneously, and if we begin a process of supplementation, it could go on ad

---

<sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs filed 28 of their 29 trial affidavits on February 2, 2007, and filed one additional affidavit on February 5, 2007.

infinitem.” The letter then proposed that defendants identify topics for supplementation to see if the parties could reach agreement about them. The letter also stated that any supplementation should be by affidavit before the close of plaintiffs’ case.

Defendants responded with an email, a copy of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, stating that plaintiffs’ suggestion was “ludicrous,” and expressing the intention to make a counterproposal. Defendants never made a counterproposal concerning supplementation.

### **CONCLUSION**

Therefore, plaintiffs respectfully request that the motion to modify trial procedures be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

ARISE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE; ;OISTE?;  
NEW ENGLAND STATE-AREA  
CONFERENCE OF THE NAACP; REV.  
TALBERT W. SWAN, II; NORMAN W.  
OLIVER; DARLENE ANDERSON;  
GUMERSINDO GOMEZ; FRANK BUNTIN;  
RAFAEL RODRIQUEZ; and DIANA NURSE

By their attorneys,

/s/ Paul E. Nemser

Paul E. Nemser (BBO #369180)  
Monica M. Franceschini (BBO #651208)  
Anna-Marie L. Tabor (BBO #662364)  
GOODWIN PROCTER LLP  
Exchange Place  
53 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 570-1000

/s/ Nadine Cohen

Nadine Cohen (BBO #090040)  
LAWYERS' COMMITTEE FOR CIVIL  
RIGHTS  
UNDER LAW OF THE BOSTON BAR  
ASSOCIATION  
294 Washington Street, Suite 443  
Boston, MA 02108  
(617) 988-0609

Dated: March 5, 2007

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned certifies that the foregoing Opposition to Motion to Modify Trial Procedures was filed electronically with this Court on this 5th day of March, 2007 and that all parties will be served via the Court's electronic filing system.

/s/ Paul E. Nemser  
Paul E. Nemser (BBO #369180)

# EXHIBIT A

GOODWIN | PROCTER

Paul E. Nemser  
617.570.1388  
pnemser@  
goodwinprocter.com

Goodwin Procter LLP  
Counselors at Law  
Exchange Place  
Boston, MA 02109  
T: 617.570.1000  
F: 617.523.1231

February 27, 2007

**By E-Mail and First Class Mail**

Edward M. Pikula, Esq.  
Deanne Bogan Ross, Esq.  
Springfield Law Department  
36 Court Street  
Springfield, MA 01103

**Re: Arise for Social Justice, et al. v. City of Springfield, et al.**  
**Civil Action No. 05-30080 MAP**

---

Dear Ed and Deanne:

We've given some thought to the issue you raise about including testimony responsive to our affidavits. We are opposed to any kind of wholesale supplementation by live testimony or by affidavit. Both sides had to submit their affidavits simultaneously, and if we begin a process of supplementation, it could go on ad infinitum. That said, we propose that you identify the topics on which you wish to supplement to see if we can agree whether supplementation is necessary. You mentioned, for example, the Michelle Webber issue, and we are willing to discuss supplementation on that topic.

We do believe that any supplementation should be done by affidavit, and any supplemental affidavit should be submitted before the close of plaintiffs' case.

Very truly yours,



Paul E. Nemser

PEN:ra

# EXHIBIT B

**Franceschini, Monica M**

---

**From:** Pikula, Edward [epikula@springfieldcityhall.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 28, 2007 11:43 AM  
**To:** Tabor, Anna-Marie; deb.ross@verizon.net  
**Cc:** Nemser, Paul E; Franceschini, Monica M; Nadine Cohen  
**Subject:** RE: Arise for Social Justice, et al. v. City of Springfield, et al.

i have reviewed this letter. your proposal is ludicrous. the way trials work is plaintiff goes first and then defendant. until you are done, we can't respond. simultaneous filing was a good idea to save time, but it can't be used to deprive the defendants their right to a fair trial. this looks to me like another attempt by your firm to gain an unfair advantage. i will prepare a counter proposal later today or tomorrow.

**Attorney Edward M. Pikula**  
**City of Springfield Law Department**  
**36 Court Street**  
**Springfield, Massachusetts 01103**  
**Phone: (413) 787- 6085**  
**Fax: (413) 787- 6173**

This e-mail message is generated from the City of Springfield Law Department, and contains information that is confidential and may be privileged as an attorney/client communication or as attorney work product. The information is intended to be disclosed solely to the addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, be aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the contents of this email information is prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify the sender by return e-mail and delete it from your computer system.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Tabor, Anna-Marie [mailto:ATabor@goodwinprocter.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 27, 2007 7:02 PM  
**To:** Pikula, Edward; deb.ross@verizon.net  
**Cc:** Nemser, Paul E; Franceschini, Monica M; Nadine Cohen  
**Subject:** Arise for Social Justice, et al. v. City of Springfield, et al.

Ed and Deanne,

Please see the attached letter.

Best regards,  
Anna

<<Letter\_20070227.pdf>>

Anna-Marie L. Tabor, Esq.  
Goodwin Procter LLP | Exchange Place, Boston, MA 02109 | T 617.570.1619 | F 617.523.1231 |  
atabor@goodwinprocter.com

3/5/2007



\*\*\*\*\* IRS

**CIRCULAR 230 DISCLOSURE:** To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* This message is intended only for the designated recipient(s). It may contain confidential or proprietary information and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege or other confidentiality protections. If you are not a designated recipient, you may not review, copy or distribute this message. If you receive this in error, please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete this message. Thank you.

\*\*\*\*\*